

REMARKS

Reconsideration is requested.

The Examiner has withdrawn claims 5-49 from further consideration

Claims 1-2 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,534,449 to Dennison et al. Claim 1 has been amended to add the limitation of claim 3. Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,534,449 to Dennison et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,786,249 to Dennison.

Claim 1, as amended, recites a semiconductor processing method of forming integrated circuitry comprising forming memory circuitry and peripheral circuitry over a substrate, the peripheral circuitry comprising first and second type MOS transistors; and conducting second type halo implants into the first type MOS transistors in less than all peripheral MOS transistors of the first type, wherein the conducting of the second type halo implants includes conducting said implants into only one of the source and drain regions in less than all of the peripheral MOS transistors of the first type, and not the other of said source and drain regions of said less than all of the peripheral MOS transistors of the first type.

Dennison '449 fails to teach or suggest the conducting of the second type halo implants includes conducting said implants into only one of the source and drain regions in less than all of the peripheral MOS transistors of the first type,

and not the other of said source and drain regions of said less than all of the peripheral MOS transistors of the first type, in combination with the other limitations of claim 1.


It would not be obvious to combine Dennison '249 with Dennison '449 because there is here is no teaching in the references themselves of how the references should be combined or of which steps of Dennison '249 should be combined with which steps of Dennison '449. There are no teachings in the references themselves which teach that there would be any advantage resulting from selecting portions of the method of Dennison '249 and integrating that method somehow into the method of Dennison '449. The mere fact that the structures of the references could possibly be somehow modified to result in the claimed structure does not render the claimed structure obvious unless the references themselves suggest the desirability of the modification. Further, Dennison knew of his own earlier work. If it would have been obvious to combine Dennison '249 with Dennison '449, Dennison himself would have done so. Therefore, the combination of references is improper and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Therefore, claim 1 is allowable. As claims 2 and 4 depend on claim 1, they too are allowable.

The Examiner is requested to phone the undersigned at any time in the event that the next Office Action is one other than a Notice of Allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 8, 2005

By: 
Deepak Malhotra, Reg. No. 33,560
Wells St. John P.S.

Customer No. 021567